IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
CRIMINAL REVISION APPLICATION NO.188 OF 2003

Sanjivani Anil Wadnere ...Applicant

vs.

Anil Muralidhar Wadnere & Ors. ...Respondents

Mr.P.K.Dhakephalkar and Mr.R.A.Karade for the Applicant
Mr.M.K.Kocharekar for Respodnent Nos.1 to 5
Ms M.M.Deshmukh, A.P.P. for State

CORAM: A.S.OKA,J.
DATE : AUGUST 17,2005

P.C.:

1. Heard Advocates for the parties. The Revision Application is filed by the original complainant for challenging the Judgment and Order passed by the learned Magistrate by which the Respondent Nos.1 to 5 were acquitted of the offences punishable under Sections 498-A, 406 read with Section 34 of I.P.C.

2. The learned Counsel for the Applicant submitted that the learned Trial Judge has ignored the material evidence on record. He submitted that there was sufficient evidence on record to show the demand of dowry by the accused and cruel treatment given to the Applicant due to failure of the Applicant and her parents to comply with the demands of the dowry. He submitted that in view of the clinching evidence on record, interference will have to be made in the impugned

Judgment and Order.

3. I have considered the submissions. The learned Magistrate recorded the finding after considering oral evidence of the prosecution witnesses that there are major discrepancies in the versions of the said witnesses. The learned Magistrate observed that there was no reference to the demand of Rs.2,00,000/- in the complaint which was earlier filed. Perusal of the impugned Judgment and Order shows that the entire oral and documentary evidence has been considered by the learned Judge. There is no manifest illegality or procedural illegality. No case is made out for interference. Revision Application is rejected.

JUDGE